

## School culture as an object of research<sup>1</sup>

Milan Pol, Lenka Hloušková, Petr Novotný, Eva Václavíková, Jiří Zounek

### Introduction

The curious and almost ephemeral, though influential phenomenon which nowadays is called *school culture*, has been contemplated in education science and schooling since long<sup>2</sup>. As Walter wrote in 1932: "Schools have a culture that is definitely their own. There are, in the school, complex rituals of personal relationships, a set of folkways, mores, and irrational sanctions, a moral code based upon them. There are games, which are sublimated wars, teams, and an elaborate set of ceremonies concerning them. There are traditions, and traditionalists waging their world-old battle against innovators" (after Deal, Peterson, 1999, p. 2). Nevertheless, school culture had long remained neglected by researchers in education, some systematic exploration having only started in the last decades.

Today, school culture is examined from miscellaneous viewpoints, using diverse methods, and following various intentions. The educational research of school culture is inspired by many disciplines. As an example, management is a field in which many relevant questions are analysed, such as how the culture unites people within an institution, how a head-teacher can influence the culture, and which tools he/she owns to do so.

Anthropologists use culture concepts accentuating linguistic codes and the implementation of school culture elements within particular ethnic groups, in the context of a wider society. Sociologists explore the social structure of culture, the variety of culture forms, and the role of culture in conflicts. The educational research of school culture points out the values which uphold individual and collective (organisational) behaviour (Berg, 2000; Deal, Peterson, 1990; and others).

The variety of options of school culture exploration make the topic nearly inexhaustible. The following review can therefore hardly be complete. The criterion of our classification has been the purpose for which the studies were prepared and performed. Such purposes, it seems, may be classified into six categories, as listed below. Though before this classification is presented, a brief history of the examination of school culture should be mentioned, and the limits of the empirical approach to this phenomenon indicated.

### On the history of school culture exploration

School culture in the proper sense of the word has only recently attracted the attention of researchers. In late 1960's and early 1970's, some influential (and often provocative) theories were saying that the social background of students was more important for the academic prosperity than the educational role of schools (e.g. Averch, 1971; Coleman, 1966; Plowden, 1967). A number of consequent studies dealt with specific subjects, such as the evaluation of the curriculum, pupils' personal problems, etc. Analyses comprehensively examining the school as a whole appeared a little later, occasionally in the 60's and more evidently in the 70's. Helpful for the exploration of school culture were especially the studies coining the terms of *school climate* and *school ethos* and pinpointing the importance of the school milieu. A strong American inspiration was, for instance, the *Organisational Climate Description Questionnaire – OCQD* by Halpin & Crofts (1963). Finlayson, a British

<sup>1</sup> A primary version of the text has been published in *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity, Brno, Masarykova univerzita v Brně, 2002, U 7, řada pedagogická*.

<sup>2</sup> The definition of the term *school culture*, including some connotations, is analysed more thoroughly in *Hledání pojmu kultura školy* (Pol et al., 2002)

author, employed the *OCQD* to design his *School Climate Index (SCI)*, 1970, 1973), as part of the *Comprehensive Schools Feasibility Study*, meant to devise tools of measuring the cognitive, affective, and social characteristics of schools. These tools were intended to examine the then originating type of secondary schools (*comprehensive schools*) in the UK.

During the 70's and 80's, noticeable emancipation of studies in educational management can be witnessed. An important event was the appearance of school effectiveness studies in the US. Brookover et al. (1978) and Edmonds (1979) were among the first to prove that – though schools cannot rectify the squeeze of the society – the influence of a the school is strong, changeable, and perfectible. The research of school effectiveness soon gained importance. Among the first European results of this stream of exploration was the work of Rutter et al. (1979) in which *ethos* is coined, the necessity of the school effectiveness research is stressed and, mainly, the evident relation between school ethos and the effectiveness of secondary schools is indicated. The attention to school culture exploration was on the increase.

A new movement aiming at the improvement of schools came up in the 1980's (*school improvement movement*). Its protagonists underlined the importance of school culture and the system of values within a school as change-enabling factors (e.g. Fullan, 1982). Simultaneously, another wave of interest in management and theories of organisation was raised in the US. The cynosure of school culture studies was then to be found in the organisational culture, the leadership, and the relation between. Besides the organisational culture (Schein, 1985), these studies focused on efficient management (Torrington, Weightman, Johns, 1989), on educational leadership, accentuating the educational job of the school (Weick, 1988; Nias, 1989), and on the explanation of the relation between school culture and change (Sarason, 1985).

Currently, the exploration of school culture is more performed at the level of a specific school (cultural analysis of a specific school), rather than at the level of certain system of schools. The 1990's have also witnessed a shift of the researchers' attention from the school as a whole towards individual sub-cultures (teachers, pupils, teaching, decision-making, etc.) or towards partial elements or processes which are perceived as relevant for, manifested through, or influenced by the culture of the school. This is explained as due to varied developments: theoretic progress, increasing focus on individual functioning within a social context, or new educational policies in many countries (underlining such educational aspects as leadership, curriculum, learning and teaching processes, improvement, academic outputs). Many consider these themes as important dimensions of school culture (Prosser, 1999). Studies deal with teachers (Acker, 1990; Berg, 2000; Hargreaves 1994), pupils (Rudduck, 1996), racism in schools (Gillborn, 1995), discipline (Johnstone, Munn, 1992), and other subjects. Frequently, such subjects get another dimension if associated with a wider cultural issue (e.g. the needs of special education in relation to cultural innovations).

While most former studies had dealt with the recognition of the phenomenon of school culture, later efforts focused more on possible changes in schools and, thus, on the process of managing the culture. One of the basic theoretical models, enabling schools to map the process of change, has been presented by Hargreaves (1995). His conviction is that the "mapping" schools have better chances to grasp and cultivate school culture.

## **On the options and limits of school culture exploration**

Researchers always face the difficult task to grasp the complex and unsettled phenomenon of school culture<sup>3</sup>. Typically, it is characterised as a hard-to-define but omnipresent and relatively stable factor, consisting of convictions, values, understandings, views, meanings, norms, symbols, rituals, ceremonies, and preferred behaviours. It is being manifested in the behaviour of people within the school. In other words, school culture consists of an empirical base and of change and quality potentials. Its crux is usually values. Divided into levels, school culture is usually identified – in both its static and dynamic versions – in its trans-rational stratum (values are perceived as metaphysical, based on convictions, ethic codes, or moral insights), in its rational stratum (values are based on the social context, norms, habits, and expectations, depending on collective consideration), and in its sub-rational stratum (values are understood as personal preferences and feelings of behavioural nature, rooted in emotions). School culture is related to outer and inner school environments, has much in common with operational and educational processes, and is important for the development of the school. It is formed in its principles and manifestations by the history of a certain educational institution. Of great influence, however, is the history and traditions of schools in general. School culture has its formal and informal aspects. Usually, there is a co-existence of a dominating culture and some sub-cultures (those of pupils, of specific groups within the staff, and so on). School culture is sometimes described as the “social cement”, holding the school together, or as a universal term for all interconnected sub-cultures, or as the recognition of “what-there-is and what-there-should-be”. Research procedures are selected accordingly (e.g. Sheil, 1985; Dalin, Rolff, 1993; Martin, 1985; Prosser, 1999).

Under attention is also the wide context of school culture – the relation between the general situation of the society and the educational and organisational operation of the school (e.g. Holtappels, 1995). Culture is often mentioned along with other terms, sometimes confusingly so.<sup>4</sup> These adjacent terms, such *school climate*, have been much more intensely explored than school culture. The expression *school culture* is heavily affected by the manner in which culture is defined outside education, impeding thus the process of “operationalisation” for its empirical research.

As it is, school culture can mainly be judged through:

- the practice, i.e. the way people in the school conduct themselves (internal symptoms)
- the values people in the school profess
- the artefacts, images, associations or metaphors people in the school use to comment on the culture

## Methods

The above options correspond closely with the methods the researchers prefer. It seems that, basically, there are three ways of empirical approach to school culture:

---

<sup>3</sup> The attitudes to the definition of *school culture* are more thoroughly examined in another study, to be published soon in *Pedagogika*. The present text gives a limited summary of characteristics of, apparently, very typical relation to school culture.

<sup>4</sup> School culture stands close to other terms with which it is often combined, sometimes as their part or as a superior category (*climate*, compare Walterová [2001] in the former case and Grecmanová [1997] in the latter), sometimes as quasi-synonymous. (Here we share Berg's [2000] opinion, saying that terms like *ethos*, [Lortie, 1975], *behavioural irregularities* [Sarason, 1971], *school code*, *micro-politics* [Hoyle, 1986; Ball, 1987] may suggest that their authors focus on a common phenomenon. In fact, though, they deal with various phenomena, for such terms are based on varied viewpoints.) It seems, however, that these efforts and terms are usually linked by a relation to a system of values of a certain institution. A clarification of the relation among these terms is another goal of our next, above mentioned study.

- Case studies, in German literature also presented as *school portraits* (Helsper et al., 1998). Obviously, what these studies describe is rather strategies than research methods. Some case studies ignore some methods (e.g. Walterová, 2001), others underscore the descriptive-and-narrative procedures (e.g. Deal Peterson, 1999). Semi-structured or structured interviews and observations belong here, too. Case studies is what helps best to grasp the culture of each school, individually (for every school does have one, no matter what kind of).
- Questionnaires, of qualitative and quantitative types. Questionnaires usually tend to generalize and compare (methodologically, they usually use more sophisticated procedures).
- Associative studies, aimed at the metaphorical perception of culture, studies of visual materials, images, spatial layout of workplaces, etc.

## **Contents**

What seems to be decisive for the approach to school culture exploration is the attitude to whether school culture can be measured. Supporters of the “non-measurability“ are numerous, rather inclining to qualitative methods of school culture exploration. If some measurability is admitted, then in a limited number of sub-areas. These sub-areas become then the basis of measuring the cultural dimensions of the school. The below examples show that the dimensions under observation can be defined rather variedly. Anyhow, the structured forms of culture exploration focus on three measurable aspects, as mentioned by Maslowski (1998):

1. Culture preferences – the basic and most frequent alternative, considering the contents of the culture: which behaviour and values are shared by people in the school, or how much conformity there is in such behaviour and values
2. Culture homogeneity – i.e. to which extent a certain kind of culture is shared by people in the school
3. Culture force – how much pressure can culture produce on people in the school

## **Purposes**

School culture exploration is rarely done for its own sake (“only” to recognize the culture). An incentive context of the exploration can usually be found, such as the effectiveness and productivity of the school, the communication potential, problems within the school, change management, experiencing, satisfaction, motivation, or identification of people within or close to the school, the purposefulness of people’s conduct in regard to what is essential in/for the school, etc. (e.g. Deal, Peterson, 1999; Prosser, 1999; Purkey, Smith, 1983; Schein, 1985).

Though some typology of such purposes has been outlined (e.g. Broadfoot, Ashkanasy, 1994, after Maslowski 1998), hereunder we give our classification, detecting six categories, or options, of purpose. Examples of performed studies are added.

### **Purpose 1, *Diagnostics and evaluation of a particular school culture***

The culture of a specific school is explored either in order to “only” be recognized (not to be worked on or altered) or in order to identify its strong and weak points, or stimulate the processes leading towards alterations in the culture of such school. Though this concept largely hopes that good school culture improves other aspects of school operation, the culture itself, and its quality, is essential. In these (auto-)diagnostic or (auto-)evaluating procedures, the quest for discrepancies, or gaps, between real and ideal situations, between the reality and expectations, is prominent. So, such studies are more or less descriptive, oscillating between managerial and research techniques.

The presented examples of this purpose are to be pondered as tools of culture diagnostics and measurement. Interpretations and conclusions can be applied on particular schools. Questionnaires are apt as self-diagnostic tools of change, development, and culture.

- Eger (2001) has set up a questionnaire for culture school evaluation. The questionnaire was administered to head-teachers and teachers, so that they could specify both the current and model situations, on a scale of 1 to 5. The presented factors were:
  - Common goals
  - Confidence in school management
  - Predominant style of leadership and relations to people
  - School regime and the organisational structure
  - Leaders' focus on work issues
  - Check-up
  - Motivation of the staff
  - Communication and informedness of the staff
  - Communication with parents and the milieu
  - Spirit of innovation
  - Teachers' development
  - Teaching conditions
  - Aesthetic environment, tidiness
  - Relations within the staff
  - Relations between teachers and pupils
  - Expectations of educational results
- Jakubíková (2000) recommends to self-diagnose school culture using the “Kilmann-Saxton’s gap“, to be found between expectations and the reality of factors like “co-operation, decision-making, communication and informedness, predominant leadership style, check-up, motivation of the staff, spirit of innovation, personnel policy, work conditions, aesthetics, image” (p. 85). These factors are judged on a 1-5 scale (1 worst, 5 best).
- Another example of self-diagnostic tools, this one describing the very crux of school culture, i.e. the norms, values, and convictions, is the School Culture Survey questionnaire, designed by Saphier & King (1985) for school culture development seminars. For instance, norms are represented by colleagueship, experimenting, high expectations; values, by clearness of targets; convictions, by team responsibility (after Maslowski, 1998). This questionnaire is further mentioned in Purpose 2.

## **Purpose 2, Identification of particular areas of culture and their actual state**

Here the research is related to schools in a rather general manner, some of the resulting tools being used for diagnostic purposes subsequently. For school culture to be explored, usually, some particular areas of school operation are selected. We deliberately call them *areas of school culture manifestation* while others use terms like *school culture determinants, factors, dimensions*, or even *characteristics or aspects* (Berg, 2000; Maslowski, 1998).

With this purpose, obviously, qualitative methods are prevailing. Using them, the selection of areas can be based on the reality of the school, as shown by the first example. Nevertheless, quantitative transformations and examinations are possible, as proved by the next case.

- Deal & Peterson (1999) have presented case studies of three schools in which specific and strong cultures were created by leaders and other teachers. The cultures were consisting of symbolic elements, identified by the researchers as: purposes and values; rites and ceremonies; history and stories; architecture and artefacts.
- To enumerate the key areas was also the goal of the pre-research of Pol et al. (2001). Culture areas were hereby classified by their importance for the development of the school. This exploration has shown that key areas probably consist of shared principles and visions of the school.
- The above-mentioned School Culture Survey tool (Saphier, King, 1985) underwent a factor analysis and other adjustments, crossed the limits of self-diagnostics, and (though originally meant for development work) was transformed into a more or less universal measurement tool, by Edwards, Green & Lyons (1996).
- A research tool called School Culture Elements Questionnaire originated as a result of the efforts to explore important culture-related aspects of school operation (Cavanagh, Dellar, 1996; after Maslowski, 1998). A rather general view is used, making out six categories: teachers' confidence in their jobs; accent on teaching; colleagueship; co-operation; shared planning; transformational leadership. The questionnaire differentiates between actual and preferred states.

### **Purpose 3, *Recognition of the characteristics of successful schools***

Such explorations are meant to find the characteristic features of successful schools. These features often coincide with the areas of school culture, some authors even mentioning here the *culture of successful school*. Some of these procedures may nowadays be regarded as equal to classic works of general management (e.g. Peters, Waterman, 1982). In the educational environment, the studies of the “movement of effective schools” must be taken into consideration. They try to create models “to identify the factors increasing or decreasing the effectiveness”. (Průcha, Mareš, Walterová, 2001, p. 55.)

- Eger & Čermák (1999) derive their conclusions from the idea that the quality of one's working life (interesting, worthwhile, and useful job, good superiors, good work conditions, good salary and social benefits) has a great impact on the values, ideas, and manners of the employees, i.e. the elements of company culture. The authors have analysed the quality of work life through another 1-5 questionnaire. It was used as a pilot questionnaire in Slovakia, then adjusted and administered to 10 schools in the Czech Republic. The sectors of the questionnaire consisted of four blocks (work life quality, work-place communication, labour evaluation, and evaluation of approach to change). The respondents should have expressed the level of their agree- or disagreement to particular statements.
- Another example of a research aimed at the identification of the characteristics of a successful school is the School Values Inventory – Form 1 (Pang, 1996; after Maslowski, 1998). This questionnaire distinguishes five culture components: 1. formalism and check-up; 2. bureaucratic rationality; 3. orientation to success; 4. participation and collaboration; 5. colleagueship. It was used to identify parameters in which “excellent schools” differ from others.
- A representative research was carried out in Saxonia in 1995. 4,000 secondary school pupils were asked about the social and environmental conditions of their lives and schools. The evaluation of the questionnaire led to the creation of the *quality index* of those schools. Partial factors were taken into consideration as well, such as the school climate. The authors say that in spite of having presented a quantitative analysis of school culture, their methods have been various. The questionnaire being rather short and simple, schools may use and analyse it internally, too (Stenke, Melzer, 1998).

### **Purpose 4, *Detection of those school culture and sub-culture characteristics supporting individual learning***

These research studies deal mainly with the influence of school culture on teachers' and students' performance. The learning process is pointed out as the key element of school operation. Culture is perceived as a determinant of the quality of the learning process, or as

the context of individual learning processes. As for the motivation to learning, “the social context and the structure of interactions offer a more interesting explanation than an individualistic perspective.“ (Pryor, Torrance, 1998, pp. 154-155.) Also mentioned are teachers and their learning, though rarely.

- Rutter and his colleagues (1979, quoted after Deal, Peterson, 1999, p. 5) have proved that school ethos is the primary power of students' academic success. They have found out that the basic norms, values, and traditions of the school help achieve goals.
- Studies (Stolp, 1994; Deal, Peterson, 1999) show that a healthy and strong school culture, based on a shared vision and common goals, correlates with students' intensified interest in learning, higher motivation, better results, as well as with teachers' better performance and satisfaction. In school cultures supporting team co-operation, better climate for social and professional exchange of experience is created, as is the one for spreading new attitudes to work. Culture strengthens the energy, motivation, and vitality of employees, students, and the community. Culture supports the attention to everyday behaviour and to what is important and valuable (Deal, Peterson, 1999).
- A comparative study of public and private schools (Bryk, Lee, Holland, 1993, after Deal, Peterson 1999, p. 6) has shown that the *sense of community* (which is very similar to school culture) was essential for the cultivation of the *sense of excellence* in private schools. Teachers in these schools were more satisfied with their jobs, and students said their teachers liked teaching and were seldom absent. Students' behaviour in these schools was better (less absence, less disturbance in classes, etc.), they rarely failed and had better results in mathematics.
- In a longitudinal study, McLaughlin (1993) has found huge differences among schools, say within the same ethnic environment. For instance, a school with 80 % Hispanic students and a school of 80 % Afro-American students had very different results even if attended by students of comparable backgrounds. McLaughlin says the difference was caused by the fact that one of these schools had struggled for a systematic development of organisational learning. The school was perceived as a place of integrity, enthusiasm, devotion, and remarkable co-operation among teachers. The school with better results had a positive, purposeful culture.

#### **Purpose 5, *Detection of school culture characteristics supporting collective or organisational learning***

In these cases we explore the features supporting the joined (organisational) learning at schools. Yet, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the individual and organisational levels of learning, especially in regard to adults in schools. That is why the following examples may often be relevant for both purposes, 4 and 5.

- An example of a relevant research is Berg's study (2000), exploring the relation between school culture and teachers' work ethos (*esprit de corps*), the latter being viewed as a determinant of the process of individual learning at school.
- Numerous studies of school culture have recently shown that culture is decisive for the improvement of teaching and learning (Fullan, 1998; Rossman, Corbett, Firestone, 1988, quoted after Deal, Peterson, 1999, p. 5). No such improvement was detected by studies in which culture had not supported and sustained a reform.
- Many a research show changes in teachers' work conditions and to teachers' professional development as pre-conditions (requisites, supporting factors) of pupils' individual learning. For instance, Bryk et al. (1994) clearly explain the relation between participatory decision-making and systematic changes in teaching and the curriculum.
- As examples of this category, studies of the “reflective practice” may be mentioned. In these procedures, (especially) teachers (individually or in collaboration with their colleagues) attempt to recognize their own jobs, look for improvements, and go for them, all through reflection. Elliot (1991) has found two of such procedures in his study (conditions of individual learning, usable for collective learning as well): 1.

reflection initiates action; 2. action initiates reflection. A similarly oriented case study is by Stoll & Fink (1997) in which – as another pre-condition – the potential of teachers' job and the results of educational surveys are mentioned.

- A large study of school revitalization has shown that a change of the structure of the school was not sufficient (Newman, 1996, after Deal, Peterson, 1999, p. 6). To be successful, both the structure and the professional culture must be changed. The authors of this five-year-study have discovered that schools were successful if their culture was primarily focused on students and their learning, high expectations, social support to innovation, dialogue, and the quest for new ideas. The "ethos of caring, sharing, and mutual help among staff, and between staff and students, based on respect, trust, and shared power relations among staff" (*ibid*, p. 289) was also present.
- Canadian researchers (Leithwood, Jantzi, Steinbach, 2000, pp. 69-78) have explored the organisational learning at schools. They led a semi-controlled interview with teachers and head-teachers in Canadian schools. The research tool consisted of 28 questions. The respondents had to enumerate the internal and external stimuli of individual and organisational learning. On average, culture has always been mentioned at least once as clearly related to collective learning. The authors have labelled culture as the part of the organisation structure having the dominant impact on learning. They have listed several characteristics of school as a learning organisation. Within this concept, culture was characterized as:
  - Collaborative
  - Shared belief in the importance of continuous professional growth
  - Norms of mutual support
  - Belief in providing honest, candid feedback to one's colleagues
  - Informal sharing of ideas and materials
  - Respect for colleagues' ideas
  - Support for risk-taking
  - Encouragement for open discussion of difficulties
  - Shared celebration of successes
  - All students valued regardless of their needs
  - Commitment to helping students (Leithwood, Jantzi, Steinbach, 2000, p. 77)
- For the purpose of the evaluation of the development potential of schools, a research tool was set up in Canada and later in the U.S., called School Work Culture Profile (Snyder, 1988). A questionnaire was distributed to teachers, examining four dimensions, through sixty items of Lickert's scale:
  - school planning: teachers', parents', students', and the community's partnership in targeting
  - professional growth: the staff co-operates in planning, organisation, coaching, and problem-solving
  - creation and materialization of programmes: the ability of the staff to provide for the student's success through teaching and the educational work of the school
  - school evaluation: staff development system; how new knowledge and skills facilitate the unfolding of problems in the school (after Maslowski, 1998).

#### **Purpose 6, *Recognition of the school culture image or of the manner the culture is perceived in***

A part of the studies in this section estimate how people understand school culture, in general, or where in the surrounding reality such culture can be seen. Some infrequent research procedures have their word here, based on associations and metaphors.

- In a pilot case study, Hejj (1995) develops his own measurement tools for a qualitative approach to school culture. The scaling is explained on numerous examples (nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio-scale), as is a number of techniques of empirical data investigation. The study focuses on the meaning of school culture objectives, through free associations and a subsequent contents analysis. Prospective teachers, 148 female (85 %) and 27 (15%) male, were addressed in the University of Hessen. Every three minutes the students were to write down their associations to school culture and, especially, to its objectives. Altogether 2066 associations appeared to school culture and 1283 to its objectives, in contents categories. The following categories of associations were related to the term of school culture:

<b>Category</b>	<b>Occurrence in %</b>
Persons within the school	12
Special events	11

Continuous offer in school	10
Location and appearance	9
Planning and organisation	9
Professional contents of teaching	7
Ideal values	6
Relation stratum	6
Means of teaching	5
Forms of teaching	5
Mediation in social behaviour	5
Leadership stratum	4
Tradition and change	3
Related education concepts	3
Climate and atmosphere	2
Criticism on school culture	2
Multi-culturalism	1

The categories related to school culture objectives were as follows:

Category	Occurrence in %
Social and relation strata	16
Support to capabilities and skills	13
Learning of social behaviour	9
Education (general and professional)	8
Development of pro-social values	6
Personal development	5
Perfection of teaching and learning	5
Atmosphere and good health	5
Capacity of criticism, maturity	5
Joy and fun	4
Independence	4
Integration and school identification	3
Creativity	3
Own initiative, involvement	3
Result, performance	2
Adaptation	2
Support to interests	2
Events beyond teaching	2
Reputation of the school	1

The objectives of school culture are summarized into three categories: the inter-individual stratum, the intra-individual stratum, and the environmental stratum.

Another part of Purpose 6 is studies trying to investigate in the visual perception of the culture of a certain school, or of schools in general. These studies use the visually-oriented methodology through which visual categories, patterns, and meanings are identified, to ergo understand what school culture consists of. Basically, two procedures are possible. The researcher either uses images he/she has generated, or the images he/she finds elsewhere (photographs of the school or of places inside, films about the school, cartoons and comics, picture postcards, symbols, etc.).

- For example, Evans (1974) observed photographs of head-teachers' offices. According to his conclusions, at least five different grades of authoritarianism can be detected. Also interesting are the layouts of some parts of the offices: they make us ask about the importance of specific artefacts therein. Evans asks, for instance, what the meaning is of the head-teacher having six different editions of the Bible on his shelf, or a memorial certificate of the British Air Force on the wall. These and alike findings make it possible for us to judge the values, convictions, and attitudes of the head-teacher, i.e. categories of essential importance for the culture of the school, as the author claims.

- Prosser & Warburton (1999) analyse cartoons and pictures related to schools, published regularly in British press. Through particular examples they detect, for instance, the cultural artefacts rooted in the communication of stereotypes.

## Conclusion

It seems that, in most cases, school culture researchers do not regard as reasonable to explore school culture, or its parts, for its own sake. It is more important to realize that such exploration usually bears its context, and is done from a certain viewpoint, within which the proper term of school culture is operationalized. The above sorting is certainly not the only possible attitude to the classification of the meanings of school culture. The classification of purposes of school culture exploration makes us contemplate other circumstances which deserve to be analysed, having been rather neglected so far. The point is mainly to find and identify some unifying and delimiting elements for particular purposes (or purpose categories) of school culture exploration, or, in other words, to find and identify the relation between these elements and the purposes of school culture exploration.

## References

ACKER, S.: Teachers' culture in an English primary school: continuity and change. In: *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11, 1990, 3, pp. 257-273.

AVERCH, H.: *How Effective is Schooling?* Santa Monica, Rand Corporation 1971.

BALL, S.J.: *The Micro-Politics of the School: Towards a Theory of School Organisation*. London, Methuen 1987.

BERG, G.: School culture and teachers' Esprit de Corps. In: Balázs, É., Wieringen v. F., Watson, L.: *Quality and educational management*. Budapest, Mueszaki Koenyiadó, 2000, pp. 49-77.

BROOKOVER, W.B., Beady, C., Flood, P.: Elementary School Social Climate and School Achievement. In: *American Educational Research Journal*, 15, 1978, pp. 301-318.

BRYK, A., LEE, V.E., HOLLAND, P.B.: *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press 1993.

BRYK, A.S., EASTON, J.Q., KERBOW, D., ROLLOW, S.G., SEBRING, P.A.: The state of Chicago school reform. In: *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 1994, 1, pp. 74-81.

COLEMAN, J.S., CAMBELL, E., HOBSON, C., MCPARTLAND, J., MOOD, A., WEINFELD, F. and York, R.: *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, National Centre for Educational Statistics 1966.

DALIN, P., ROLFF, H.: *Changing the School Culture*. London, Cassell 1993.

DEAL, T.E., PETERSON, K.D.: *Shaping School Culture*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass 1999.

DEAL, T.E., PETERSON, K.D.: *The Principal's Role in Shaping School Culture*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education 1990.

EDMONDS, R.R.: Some Schools Work and More Can. In: *Social Policy*, 9, 1979.

EGER, L.: *Řízení kvality a kultury školy*. Manuscript, not dated.

EGER, L., Čermák, J.: Podniková kultura a kvalita pracovního života na základních školách. In: *Pedagogika*, 1999, XLIX, 1, pp.57-68.

ELLIOT, J.: *Action Research for Educational Change*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press 1991.

EVANS, K.: The Head and His Territory. In: *New Society*, 24 October 1974.

FINLAYSON, D.S.: *School Climate Index*. Slough, NFER 1970.

FINLAYSON, D.S.: Measuring school climate. In: *Trends in education*, 30, 1973.

FULLAN, M.: Leadership for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Breaking the Bonds of Dependency. In: *Educational Leadership*, April 1998, pp. 6-10.

FULLAN, M.: *The Meaning of Educational Change*. New York, OISE/Teachers' Press 1982.

GILLBORN, D.: *Racism and Anti-Racism in Real Schools*. Buckingham, Open University Press 1995.

GRECMANOVÁ, H.: Typy školskej klímy a jej vplyvy. In: *Pedagogická revue*, 1997, 49, 5-6, pp. 258-266.

HALPIN, A. W., CROFT, D. B.: *The Organisational Climate of Schools*. Chicago, University of Chicago 1963.

HARGREAVES, D. H.: School culture, school effectiveness and school improvement. In: *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 6, 1995, 1, pp. 23-46.

HARGREAVES, D. H.: *The Mosaic of Learning: Schools and Teachers for the Next Century*. London, Demos 1994.

HEJJ, A. Empirische Methoden zur Erfassung der Schulkultur. In: Holtappels, H.G. (eds.) *Beiträge zur Schulentwicklung. Ansätze und Wege schulischer Erneuerung*. Luchterhand, Institut für Schulentwicklungsforschung Universität Dortmund, 1995, pp. 97-115.

HELSPER, W., BOEHNE, J., KRAMER, R.-T., LINGKOST, A.: Entwürfe zu einer Theorie der Schulkultur und des Schulmythos – strukturtheoretische, mikropolitische, und rekonstruktive Perspektiven. In: Keufer, J. (eds.). *Schulkultur als Gestaltungsaufgabe. Partizipation – Management – Lebensweltgestaltung*. Weinheim, Deutscher studien Verlag, 1998. pp. 29-75.

HOLTAPPELS, H.G.: Schulkultur und Innovation – Ansätze, Trends und Perspektiven der Schulentwicklung. In: Holtappels, H. G.(eds.) *Beiträge zur Schulentwicklung. Ansätze und Wege schulischer Erneuerung*. Luchterhand, Institut für Schulentwicklungsforschung Universität Dortmund, 1995, pp. 6-36.

HOYLE, E.: *The Politics of School Management*. London, Hodder and Stoughton 1986.

JAKUBÍKOVÁ, D.: Kultura škol (Part 1-4). *Učitelské listy (Příloha pro ředitele)*. 1999, 9, 10; 2000, 1, 2.

JOHNSTONE, M., MUNN, P.: *Discipline in Scottish Schools*. Edinburgh, Scottish Council for Research in Education 1992.

LEITHWOOD, K., SEASHORE, Louis, K. (eds): *Organizational Learning in Schools*. Lisse, Swets & Zeitlinger 2000.

LORTIE, D.: *Schoolteacher, A Sociological Study*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1975.

MARTIN, J.: Can organisational culture be managed? In: Frost, P., Moore, L., Louis, M., Lundberg, C. and Martin, J. (eds): *Organisational Culture*. Beverley Hills, Sage 1985.

MASLOWSKI, R.: *A survey of instruments for measuring school culture*. Paper presented at the ECER conference, 1998, Ljubljana, Slovenia, 17–20 September.

MCLAUGHLIN, M.W.: *What matters most in teachers' workplace context?* Washington D.C., Office for Educational Research and Improvement 1993.

NIAS, J.: Teachers' moral purposes: stress, vulnerability and strength. In: Huberman, M., Vandenberghe, R. (eds): *Teacher Burnout*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1989.

PETERS, T. J., WATERMAN, R.H.: *In Search of Excellence*. New York, Harper & Row, 1982

Plowden Committee: *Children and Their Primary School*. London, Holt, Reinhart and Winston 1967.

POL, M., HLOUŠKOVÁ, L., NOVOTNÝ, P., VÁCLAVÍKOVÁ, E., ZOUNEK, J.: Kultura české školy a strategie jejího rozvoje – k předvýzkumné fázi projektu. In: *Nové možnosti*

vzdělávání a pedagogický výzkum. Proceedings of 9th ČAPV National Conference (27–28 June 2001), Ostrava, ČAPV – PedF OU 2001, pp. 244-247.

POL, M., HLOUŠKOVÁ, L., NOVOTNÝ, P., VÁCLAVÍKOVÁ, E., ZOUNEK, J.: Hledání pojmu kultura školy. In: *Pedagogika*, 2002, 2, being printed.

PROSSER, J. (ed.): *School Culture*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing - SAGE 1999.

PROSSER, J., WARBURTON, T.: Visual Sociology and School Culture. In: Prosser, J. (ed.): *School Culture*. London, Paul Chapman Publishing - SAGE 1999, pp. 82-97.

PRŮCHA, J., WALTEROVÁ, E., MAREŠ, J.: *Pedagogický slovník*. Praha, Portál 2001.

PRYOR, J., TORRANCE, H.: Formative Assessment in the Classroom: Where Psychological Theory Meets Social Practice. In: *Social Psychology of Education*, 1998, 2, pp. 151-176.

PURKEY, S.C., SMITH, M.S.: Effective Schools: A Review. In: *The Elementary School Journal*, March 1983.

RUDDUCK, J., CHAPLAIN, R., WALLACE, G.: *School Improvement: What Can Pupils Tell Us?* London, David Fulton 1996.

RUTTER, M., MAUGHAN, B., MORTIMORE, P., OUSTON, J.: *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*. London, Open Books 1979.

SARASON, S. B.: *The Culture of School and the Problem of Change*. Massachusetts, Allyn and Bacon 1971 (reprint 1985).

SEIHL, C.: After the founder: an opportunity to manage culture. In: Frost, P., Moore, L., Louis, M., Lunberg, C. and Martin, J. (eds): *Organisational Culture*. Beverly Hills, Sage 1985.

SCHEIN, E.H.: *Organisational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass 1985.

STENKE, D., MELZER, W.: Schulkultur aus der Sicht der quantitativ orientierten Schulentwicklungsforschung. In: Keuffer, J. (eds.). *Schulkultur als Gestaltungsaufgabe. Partizipation – Management – Lebensweltgestaltung*. Weinheim, Deutscher studien Verlag, 1998. pp. 141-161.

STOLP, S.: *Leadership for school culture*.  
<http://www.eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digest/digest091.html> (2 April 2000)

STOLL, L., FINK, D.: *Changing our schools*. Buckingham, Open University Press 1996.

TORRINGTON, D., WEIGHTMAN, J., JOHNS, K.: *Effective Management*. Hemel Hempstead, Prentice Hall 1989.

WALTEROVÁ, E.: Problém vnitřní konzistence případové studie školy. In: *Nové možnosti vzdělávání a pedagogický výzkum*. Proceedings of 9th ČAPV National Conference (27–28 June 2001), Ostrava 2001, pp. 88-91.

WEICK K.E.: Educational organisations as loosely coupled systems. In: Westoby, A. (eds): *Culture and Power in Educational Organisations*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press 1988.